



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/837,448	04/17/2001	Michael McClary	004906.P030	2389

7590 05/08/2003
Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafmann
12400 Wilshire Blvd
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

STEVENS, ROBERTA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2665

DATE MAILED: 05/08/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/837,448

Applicant(s)

MCCLARY ET AL.

Examiner

Roberta A Stevens

Art Unit

2665

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
3. Claims 1-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beckner (U.S. 4819226) in view of Hodohara (U.S. 5187711).
4. Regarding claims 1, 8, 16, 27, 39-41 Beckner teaches (abstract and figure 1 and 12) a method and apparatus for a line card in a network element comprising; a deframer unit to receive a TDM signal; a packet engine unit coupled to the deframer, to receive data to generate packet engine packets representing a frame within the TDM signal; a packer processor coupled to the deframer to receive the packet engine packets and generate network packets.
5. Beckner does not teach frame alignment data.

Art Unit: 2665

6. Hodohara teaches (abstract and figure 1) data including a payload and overhead to generate frame alignment data based on the overhead data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to adapt to Beckner's system, Hodohara's frame alignment process in order to maintain synchronism in the system and minimize error.

7. The differences in claims 1 and 8 involve the adding additional line cards. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to have more than one line card as matter of design choice.

8. Regarding claims 2-7, 9-15, 17-19, 22-26, 28-31, 36-38 and 42-46, as mentioned above, Beckner and Hodohara teach all of the limitations of claims 1, 8 and 41.

9. As for DS-1, DS-3, DS0, DS-0, E3 and J1 signals are concerned, they are all well known in the art and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to adapt to Beckner and Hodohara's system as a matter of design choice.

10. Regarding claims 20 and 32, as for packets including Internet Protocol, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to apply this concept to Beckner and Hodohara's system as a matter of design choice.

11. Regarding claim 21 and 33-35, Beckner teaches (abstract and figure 1 and 12) a method and apparatus for a line card in a network element comprising; a deframer unit to receive a TDM signal; a packet engine unit coupled to the deframer, to receive the data to generate packet engine packets representing a frame within the TDM signal; a packer processor coupled to the deframer to receive the packet engine packets and generate network packets.

12. Beckner does not teach frame alignment.

Art Unit: 2665

13. Hodohara teaches including a payload and overhead, the deframer to generate frame alignment data based on the overhead data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to adapt to Beckner's system, Hodohara's frame alignment process in order to maintain synchronism in the system and minimize error.

14. Beckner and Hodohara do not teach a second TDM signal and packet engine. However it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to adapt this concept to Beckner and Hodohara's system to accommodate different types of TDM signals.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Marakami (U.S. 5113395) is cited to show the state of the art.

16. Any inquiry concerning the communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roberta Stevens whose telephone number is (703) 308-6607. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 am to 5:30 p.m.

17. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor can be reached on (703) 308-6602.

18. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

19. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Art Unit: 2665

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314

For informal draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA. Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Roberta A. Stevens

Patent Examiner

05-02-03



ALPUS H. HSU
PRIMARY EXAMINER